REMARKS

By the present amendment, the specification has been amended to insert section headings, and claim 1 has been amended to recite "at least one of… and…" instead of "and/or" and to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4.

Accordingly, claim 4 has been cancelled and claims 5-6 and 8 have been amended to depend on claim 1 instead of claim 4.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

I. Objections

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to as lacking section headings.

Also, in the Office Action, claim 1is objected to as reciting "and/or" instead of "at least one of… and…"

The specification and claim 1 have been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objections should be withdrawn.

II. Art rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,378,297 to Ito et al. ("Ito") in view of US 2004/0065078 to Schafer-Sindlinger et al. ("Schafer").

It is alleged in the Office Action that Ito discloses the present invention except the fuel additive and catalyst impregnation of the particle filter, but that Schafer discloses these features as conventional.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. It is submitted that paragraph 0051 of Schafer does not disclose a region of the particle filter that is more strongly impregnated with the oxidation catalyst. Namely, Schafer only discloses that the catalyst water suspension is "carefully milled and then poured over the inlet end faces of the filter structures" (Schafer at para. 0051).

Thus, not only, there is no teaching or suggestion that the inlet end faces should receive more catalyst deposition, but also, it is immediately apparent that the liquid dispersion of Schafer should result in a homogeneous distribution of catalyst over the surface to which the charged liquid is applied. Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art would expect that the liquid dispersion should be "poured over" the filter faces without differentiation, and further, no increased deposition should be present upon drying, and especially not toward the inlet side. As a result, Schafer fails to teach or suggest a region of the particle filter that is more strongly impregnated with the oxidation catalyst, as recited in present claim 1. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over any combination of Ito and Schafer.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 502759.

Respectfully submitted,

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,373

Nicolas E. Seckel
Patent Attorney
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 669-5169
Fax: (202) 822-1257
Customer No.: 29980
NES/rep